



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SENATOR OWEN OBJECTS

WASHINGTON, D. C.

SIR,—I read with great interest the contribution to your December issue by Dr. David Jayne Hill, entitled "The Crisis in Constitutionalism." I read it in full in the Senate yesterday (December 22, 1913), in order that it might appear in the *Congressional Record* and thereby attain an enlarged circulation. I inclose it as printed in the *Record*. You will notice that at the conclusion of my reading of the article I asked that it might be printed as a public document, to which objection was made by Senator Owen of Oklahoma. I am having about 10,000 reprints of this article made from the *Record* to send to some of my constituents in Connecticut.

FRANK B. BRANDEGEE.

SPEAKING GENERALLY

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 10, 1913.

SIR,—Please do not accept my inclosed subscription to THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW as an approval of your editorial criticism of President Wilson and his administration. From my point of view, your criticisms are not well taken. The President is only a part of our governmental machinery, and he has no legislative power except of a negative kind, namely, the option of vetoing any bill passed by the Congress. The right to veto must be regarded as a latent rather than an active force. It is becoming less frequently exercised, with a tendency toward obsolescence, in all governments where it appertains to the executive. Therefore, it would seem that the Executive in a Constitutional Government who abstains from the use of the veto pursues the wiser course, for the very essence of Constitutional Government is the harmonious co-operation of the co-ordinate powers. From this standpoint President Wilson in signing the bill exempting laborers and farmers from prosecution under certain conditions was quite within his rights. Furthermore, the bill had been twice passed almost unanimously by the Congress, and unless self-government is a failure the President who under those circumstances would have vetoed the bill could only be considered as mulishly stubborn.

President Wilson's policy meets my hearty approval because it is based on ethical principles and not on the expediency of greed. Those persons who invested in Mexico did so on the theory that they were obtaining valuable concessions at a small cost that opened up a *chance* for huge profits. They took the *chance*. In other words, the transaction was a gamble and not legitimate business. It is no more the office of the United States Government to protect gamblers in Mexican concessions than gamblers in the ordinary pool-room. The internal disorders and anarchy in Mexico do not concern us only as our international relations are affected thereby.

As to segregation, that is not a wrong to the negro, while congregation is a wrong to the white man and woman who are affected by a sense of humiliation—all the more real because wantonly imposed by their government. Has not segregation in the army been a help to the negro? How otherwise should we have ever known of the courage and the bravery of the black regiments? In like manner may not civil segregation afford our negro citizens more and better opportunities to develop their co-operation for that kind of work?

Lastly, according to your writings, President Wilson has repudiated the